

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,328	10/03/2000	Yasuo Takane	0905-0247P-SP	4817
7590 10/31/2005 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP			EXAMINER	
			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
P.O.Box 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747				TATER NOMBER
			2615	
			DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/678,328	TAKANE, YASUO	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Yogesh K. Aggarwal	2615	
The MAILING DATE of this co	mmunication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM - Extensions of time may be available under the p after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the first of the period for reply is specified above, the mainer of the period for reply within the set or extended period Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.3	THE MAILING DA rovisions of 37 CFR 1.13 his communication. ximum statutory period w for reply will, by statute, months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. FD. (35 U.S.C. & 133)	
Status				
	2b)⊠ This ndition for allowan	igust 2005. action is non-final. ice except for formal matters, pr x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4		
Disposition of Claims			•	
	and 12 is/are verification. The rejected. The re	election requirement.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is obje				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal R 6) Other:		

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/08/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (US Patent # 6,515,698) in view of Iwasaki (US Patent # 5,987,265).

 [Claim 1]

Sasaki et al. teaches an imaging device (figure 12, CCD 101) for imaging a subject, to output image data representing an image of the subject (col. 7 lines 26-35), an exposure control device (109) for controlling an amount of exposure in said imaging device on the basis of the photometry values outputted by said photometry device (external light sensor 107, col. 7 lines

40-45, col. 8 lines 30-35, col. 10 lines 40-col. 11 line 3, figure 16); an image file create device (109) for creating an image file containing the image data (figure 14, image data 209) outputted from said imaging device (101) and data representing the photometry values (figure 14 discloses a file having information on white balance 207) outputted from said photometry device (107), the image file create device (109) creating the image file for imaging by said imaging device, and a recording control device (109) for recording the image file (figure 14 shows an image file along with header containing white balance information 207 and the image file 209) created by said image file create device on a recording medium (detachable semiconductor memory 111, col. 7 lines 35-45, col. 8 lines 30-42).

Sasaki fails to teach a photometry device for performing photometry for each of the sections obtained by dividing an imaging area into a plurality of sections to output photometry values. However Iwasaki teaches a camera (figure 2) having a photometry sensor 9 for performing photometry for each of the sections obtained by dividing an imaging area into a plurality of sections to output photometry values (col. 5 lines 10-35, figures 2 and 3).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Sasaki and Iwasaki, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have used a photometry device for performing photometry for each of the sections obtained by dividing an imaging area into a plurality of sections to output photometry values as taught in Iwasaki into the system of Sasaki in order to improve the performance of scene discrimination and proper exposure operation as taught in Iwasaki (col. 2 lines 40-45).

[Claim 13]

Art Unit: 2615

Sasaki teaches that white balance control values read from the header part 207 and are multiplied by RGB values of the image to calculate luminance (exposure) (col. 10 lines 40-64) and therefore reads on wherein the output values of the photometry device (light sensor 107) are directly used to determine an amount of exposure.

[Claims 10 and 14]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 1 and 13 and are therefore analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 10 and 13 respectively.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K. Aggarwal whose telephone number is (571) 272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

- 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571)-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/678,328

Art Unit: 2615

October 20, 2005

DAVID L. OMETZ SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 5